

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of May 20, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 8-10, 18, 25, and 32 have been amended, claims 7, 19, and 42 have been canceled, no new claims have been added, and claims 2-6, 11-17, 20-24, 26-31, 33-41, and 43-49 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 11-14, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, 29-42, and 44-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,159, hereinafter referred to as *Kikinis*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to reject a claim as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention. MPEP § 706.02. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include features similar to canceled claim 7, and now recites, *inter alia*:

associating one or more of the device feature values with a requesting user network terminal device in response to said requesting user network terminal device transmitting a request for the authored content; and

converting the device-independent content into a device-specific content adapted to said requesting user network terminal device, *wherein said converting is based on annotation of the authored content with markup information corresponding to one or more device feature values*,

such that said device-specific content provides for a display on said requesting user network terminal device in a format as intended by the content author  
(emphasis added)

However, *Kikinis* does not teach or suggest converting content based on the author's intent as indicated in annotations corresponding to one or more device feature values as recited in claim 1 above. *Kikinis* teaches transmitting an appropriate amount and form of information to a device based on its features stating that "[c]onnection to the Proxy-Server provides the Proxy-Server with information as to the subscriber and the subscriber's equipment." (*Kikinis* col. 8, lines 30-32). *Kikinis* further describes this transmission in that

the Proxy-Server converts all of the .jpg files to a dithered bitmap format according to information associated with the user ID received from the hand-held at log on. This ID establishes the size and resolution of the hand-held's display, for example, and the bitmap created from the .jpg files is scaled to the hand-held's display.

(*Kikinis* col. 10, lines 19-24).

*Kikinis* never mentions the intentions of the author of the content that is being transmitted to the device, but instead only describes autonomous data transformation. Even more compelling is the fact that *Kikinis* does not convert pages based on annotations within the pages themselves, as claimed.

On the other hand, the specification of the present application indicates that autonomous data transformation can be sufficient at times, but

there are also many examples of authored content where such an autonomous transformation is prone to destroy content fidelity because the autonomous system is unaware of the 'meaning' of the content. In such cases, author intent is required as an input so that the transformation system may defer decision-making to the author via author intent as embedded in the authored content.

(Application page 13-14).

An example where author intent is not needed is "when text layout on a display screen requires line breaks to be inserted at appropriate places so that the screen is filled up without any cropping or overflows. Such transformations are referred to in the relevant art as 'autonomous transformations' and do not require author participation." (Application page 17). On the other hand, there are many instances when the author's intent is needed to retain the integrity and quality of the work.

[A] news article containing hundreds of words of text must be edited if it is to fit into the small display and memory of a wireless phone or PDA. Such editing cannot be done automatically because the software is not sophisticated enough to understand the content and to decide what text should be kept and which text should be discarded. It is left to a person to make this decision by reading and understanding the content to determine the author intent.

Obviously, the person most qualified to state author intent is the content author. For example, the content author may wish to specify which parts of the news article should be retained for a small display, for a medium display, and for a large display.

(Application page 17, figure numbers omitted)

Kikinis therefore does not anticipate claim 1 because Kikinis neither bases any transformation on author intent, nor does Kikinis convert a web page based on annotations within the web page itself. Claim 7 has been canceled, rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Claims 2 – 6 and 8 – 17, which depend back to claim 1, are not anticipated by the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Independent claims 18, 25, and 32 have also been amended to include the use of author's intent when transforming device independent content into device dependent content, which distinguishes the present invention from prior art, as discussed above. Claims 20-24, which are dependent upon claim 18, claims 26-31, which are dependent upon claim 25, and claims 33-41 and 43-49, which are dependent upon claim 32, are not anticipated by the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 7-10, 19, 21, 26, 30, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kikinis* in view of Moore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,601, hereinafter referred to as *Moore*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 7 and 19 have been cancelled and incorporated into independent claims 1 and 18, respectively. The other independent claims 25 and 32 have also been amended to incorporate the feature of using author's intent when transforming device independent content into device dependent content. Because claim 7 was canceled in view of amended claim 1, however, the features of claim 7 will be addressed in the context of amended claim 1.

This combination of *Kikinis* and *Moore* does not cover the author's intent as claimed because *Moore* is solely concerned with and only mentions scaling of images based on dimensions of the requested webpage embedded in html code. Scaling images based on html

code is completely independent from the capabilities of the requesting device in that “[t]he resulting resized or scaled images will be uniform across a variety of Web browser client regardless of the computational resources available at each client.” (Moore col. 6, lines 26-28). Thus, Moore actually teaches away from the claimed invention. Furthermore, scaling images is not based on an author’s intent, as it is only concerned with the size of the image. The images are simply resized based on an algorithm regardless of content, regardless of author’s intent, and regardless of the device on which it will be displayed. This resizing process is more analogous to an autonomous system mentioned above. Applying the present invention to images might include the author of the image taking such an action, for example, of choosing certain portions of the image to display to network devices that only had limited space on their screens.

*Kikinis* does not teach or suggest including the author’s intent in the data transformation and only concentrates on those features that are associated with the device receiving the transmission for display. *Kikinis* in combination with *Moore* also does not describe adapting content to the author’s intent, as the combination only concerns resizing images. The present invention describes how factoring in the content author’s intent solves an important problem in the data transformation process from a device-independent to a device-dependent form that cannot be accomplished by an autonomous system. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that from the claimed invention is not obvious over *Kikinis* in view of *Moore*.

Claims 8-10, which depend back to claim 1, claim 21, which depends back to claim 18, claims 26 and 30, which depend back to claim 25, and claim 43, which depends back to claim 32, are not obvious over *Kikinis* in view of *Moore* for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

For example, with respect to claims 8-10, *Kikinis* does not describe the use of a meta-data markup language to convey the author’s intent. Claim 10 states the method of “identifying that content in said authored content which requires author annotation; and embedding meta-data into said content requiring author annotation, said meta-data based on the feature values.” (Office Action Claim 10). *Kikinis* only describes conveying “information as to the subscriber and the subscriber’s equipment,” (*Kikinis* col. 8, lines 31-32) but never mentions that information being transmitted in the form of meta-data. *Moore* does not cure this deficiency. Thus, even if

combined, Kikinis and Moore do not teach or suggest all the recitations of these claims, and they are allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 15, 27, 28, 48, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kikinis* in view of Rohrbaugh et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091738, hereinafter referred to as *Rohrbaugh*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 15, which depends back to claim 1, claims 27 and 28, which depend back to claim 25, and claims 48 and 49, which depend back to claim 32, are not unpatentable over *Kikinis* in view of *Rohrbaugh* based on the patentability of their ultimate base claim as the additional reference does not cure the deficiencies of *Kikinis*, and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kikinis* in view of Lo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,040, hereinafter referred to as *Lo*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 16, which depends back to claim 1, is not unpatentable over *Kikinis* in view of *Lo* based on the patentability of its ultimate base claim as the additional reference does not cure the deficiencies of *Kikinis*, and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

In addition, claim 16 describes the conversion as

- determining that said authored content is marked as having a uni-axis free form characteristic;
- identifying the number of segments supported by the display in said requesting user network terminal device;
- concatenating a number of rows for sending to said requesting user network terminal device if said uni-axis free form characteristic includes a list characteristic, wherein said number of rows corresponds to said number of segments supported; and
- concatenating a number of columns for sending to said requesting user network terminal device if said uni-axis free form characteristic includes a column characteristic, wherein said number of columns corresponds to said number of segments supported.

(Claim 16).


*Lo* does not cure *Kikinis* by describing such steps of a conversion. *Lo* simply mentions a “table summarizer module” (*Lo* col. 6, lines 50-51), but does not describe the transformation steps taken by the module. Therefore, the description in *Lo* does not teach or suggest that which is recited in claim 16.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

Date: Aug 19, 2005

By:   
Ross A. Dannenberg  
Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Eleventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
(202) 824-3000